

nails stronger, to benefit the nervous and digestive systems, and to contribute to energy, vitality, and general good health;

That the *Super Potency Aller-Cedic (Improved) Capsules* would be efficacious in the treatment of hay fever, asthma, rose fever, food allergies, hives, and sinus and bronchial trouble;

That the *Super Potency Nura-Plex Special Formula No. 10 Capsules* would be efficacious in the treatment of arthritis pains, neuritis pains, rheumatic pains, constipation, fatigue, nervousness, backaches, bleeding gums, and sciatica;

That the *Arthradex Capsules* would be efficacious in the treatment of arthritis;

That the *Hebron Tablets* would be efficacious to supply new zest and vitality;

And that the *Super Potency Ultra Hy "E" Capsules* would be efficacious in the treatment of sore backs, aching limbs, muscle inflammation, and bursitis (primary fibrositis); that it would be a factor for healthy muscle; and that it would be of value to the reproductive processes.

The products would not be efficacious for the purposes represented and suggested.

**DISPOSITION:** April 28, 1947. A plea of guilty having been entered on behalf of the corporation and Milton S. Frankle on all 8 counts, each defendant was fined \$25 on counts 1 and 2 and \$12.50 on counts 3 to 8, inclusive, a total fine of \$250, plus costs.

**2281. Misbranding of Sulgly-Minol. U. S. v. Walter W. Gramer. Plea of guilty. Defendant given deferred sentence and placed on probation for 30 days. (F. D. C. No. 21459. Sample Nos. 19338-H, 50750-H.)**

**INFORMATION FILED:** March 6, 1947, District of Minnesota, against Walter W. Gramer, Minneapolis, Minn.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about January 19 and 24, 1946, from the State of Minnesota into the States of Iowa and Wisconsin.

**PRODUCT:** Analysis disclosed that the product consisted essentially of an alkaline solution of lime and sulfur, together with a small amount of glycerin.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement "Recommended as an aid for the relief of arthritic and rheumatic pains" was false and misleading, since the article would not be efficacious as an aid for the relief of arthritic and rheumatic pains.

**DISPOSITION:** November 3, 1947. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court disposed of the case by imposition of a deferred sentence and by placing the defendant on probation for 30 days.

**2282. Misbranding of Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths. U. S. v. 80 Packages \* \* \* and a number of placards. (F. D. C. No. 16044. Sample No. 2859-H.)**

**LABEL FILED:** On or about April 18, 1945, District of Columbia.

**PRODUCT:** *Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths*. 80 packages of the product were offered for sale in the District of Columbia by the Vita Health Food Co., Washington, D. C., and a number of placards entitled "Relief from Body Aches and Pains" accompanied this product. Examination indicated that the product consisted essentially of sodium sulfate, carbonate, phosphate, borax, and sulfur.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths \* \* \* Sante Chemical Co. N. Y."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the placards and in a leaflet entitled "Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths" enclosed with the article were false and misleading, since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective in bringing the world's great mineral baths into one's home; that it would be effective to bring relaxation and relief from aches, pain, and itching; that it would be effective in the treatment of rheumatism, arthritis, neuritis, gout, lumbago, sciatica, and generalized skin conditions; that it would stimulate circulation; that it would refresh and revitalize and bathe away aches, pains, and fatigue; that it would aid in eliminating body odor; that it would, if used frequently and for long periods, remedy stubborn cases of long standing; that it would insure deep, refreshing sleep if used before retiring; that sulfur is a remedy for diseases generally; and that colloidal sulfur would penetrate the skin. The article would not fulfill the promises of benefit stated and implied by such statements.

**DISPOSITION:** The Sante Chemical Co., Inc., claimant, having agreed to the removal of the case to the Eastern District of New York, an order directing such removal was entered on August 3, 1945. The claimant subsequently consented to the entry of a decree, and on March 25, 1946, judgment of condemnation was entered in the Eastern District of New York. In accordance with that judgment, an order was entered in the District of Columbia, providing for the destruction of the product.

**2283. Misbranding of Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths. U. S. v. 38½ Dozen Packages \* \* \*. (F. D. C. No. 16053. Sample No. 4062-H.)**

**LIBEL FILED:** April 21, 1945, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about December 15, 1944, and January 6, 1945, by the Sante Chemical Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.

**PRODUCT:** 38½ dozen packages of *Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths* at Philadelphia, Pa. Examination showed that the product consisted essentially of sodium sulfate, carbonate, phosphate, borax, and sulfur.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in a leaflet entitled "Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths" enclosed with the article were false and misleading, since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective in bringing the world's great mineral baths into one's home; that if added to the bath it would bring relaxation and relief from pain to those afflicted with rheumatism, arthritis, neuritis, and lumbago; that it would bring relief from itching in certain types of generalized skin conditions; that it would stimulate the circulation and would refresh and vitalize; that it would bathe away aches, pains, and fatigue; that it would aid in eliminating body odor; that it would, if used frequently and for long periods, remedy stubborn cases of long standing; and that it would insure deep, refreshing sleep if used before retiring. The article would not be effective in the treatment of the conditions named, and it would not fulfill the promises of benefit stated and implied.

**DISPOSITION:** March 25, 1946. The Sante Chemical Co., Inc., claimant, having agreed to the removal of the case to the Eastern District of New York, an order directing its removal was entered on December 6, 1945. The claimant subsequently consented to the entry of a decree, and on March 25, 1946, judgment of condemnation was entered in the Eastern District of New York.

**2284. Misbranding of Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths. U. S. v. 12 Dozen Packages and 7 Dozen Packages \* \* \* (and 2 other seizure actions). (F. D. C. Nos. 16336, 16371, 16701. Sample Nos. 4090-H, 4091-H, 14775-H, 16537-H.)**

**LIBELS FILED:** On or about June 2 and 27 and July 26, 1945, Eastern District of Pennsylvania and Northern District of Illinois.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** Between the approximate dates of April 4 and May 3, 1945, by National Healthaids, Inc., from New York, N. Y.

**PRODUCT:** *Sul-Ray Colloidal Sulphur Mineral Baths*. 19 dozen packages at Philadelphia, Pa.; and 429 packages and 5 cases, each case containing 6 packages, at Chicago, Ill. Examination indicated that the product consisted of baking soda, sodium sulfate, table salt, sulfur, cornstarch, a borate, and a phosphate.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling of the article was false and misleading in the same respect as that of the article reported in notices of judgment on drugs and devices, No. 2283.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (i), the containers in two of the lots were so filled as to be misleading, since they were too large to hold the quantity of the material placed therein.

**DISPOSITION:** The Sante Chemical Co., Inc., claimant for the Philadelphia lot and the Chicago lot of 429 packages, having agreed to the consolidation and the removal of the cases against both lots to the Eastern District of New York, and after the removal of the cases, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered on March 25, 1946. No claimant having appeared for the Chicago lot of 5 cases, judgment of condemnation was entered against that lot and it was ordered destroyed.